

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. The specification and claims 4, 5 and 15 are amended solely to correct informalities. Thus, the claims are not narrowed by such amendments. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that the Office Action indicates that claims 7 and 8 include allowable subject matter.

II. Rejections Under 35 §§102(e) and 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,730,913 to Remillard et al. (Remillard); rejects claims 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Remillard in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,268,685 to Stark et al. (Stark); and rejects claims 9-12, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Remillard. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Remillard does not disclose, teach or suggest a side turn signal light including "an infrared reduction member which reduces infrared light of flashing light emitted by the lamp bulb and which is provided for one of the lamp bulb and a periphery of the lamp bulb," as recited in independent claim 1.

Remillard teaches a device and method for detecting objects with a night vision system 10. See Fig. 1 and Abstract. The night vision system includes a receiver 15 having a near-infrared (NIR) camera 20 and an optical band pass filter 22. See Fig. 1. Remillard also teaches that light emitted by an illumination subsystem 13 is reflected by an object and received by the camera 20. See col. 4, lines 11-13. Further, Remillard teaches that the optical band pass filter 22 allows only components of the light that are within an NIR light spectrum to be received by the camera 20. See col. 1, lines 26-30, col. 3, lines 66-67 and col. 4, lines

20-31. Therefore, Remillard merely teaches only allowing a certain component of light, i.e., NIR light, that is emitted by an illumination subsystem 13 to enter the camera 20.

Remillard does not teach or suggest that the band pass filter 22 affects the emission of light from headlamps. Specifically, Remillard does not teach or suggest that the band pass filter 22 allows only a NIR component of light to be emitted from the headlamps. Therefore, Remillard does not teach or suggest the side turn signal light including the infrared reduction member of claim 1.

Contrary to Remillard, the infrared reduction member of claim 1 may reduce an amount of near-infrared light emitted by a lamp bulb. For example, a side turn signal light 18 includes a lens 22 and a light bulb 20. See Fig. 2, and paragraph [0036] of the specification. A circumference of the lamp bulb 20 may be coated with a coating that reduces a near-infrared component of light emitted by the lamp bulb 20 while allowing only a visible component of light emitted by the lamp bulb 20 to pass through. See paragraph [0046] of the specification. Alternatively, an entire surface of the lens 22 may be cover with a film that reduces a near-infrared component of light emitted by the lamp bulb 20 while allowing only a visible component of light emitted by the lamp bulb 20 to pass through. See paragraph [0046] of the specification.

In other words, the coating and film do not allow a near-infrared component of light to be irradiated from outside of the side turn signal light 18. See paragraph [0047] of the specification. As a result, a dazzle inhibiting effect can be achieved when the side turn signal light 18 is lit. See paragraphs [0047] - [0049] of the specification. Remillard does not teach or suggest such features or provide such advantages.

Remillard also does not disclose, teach or suggest a vehicle periphery device including "a display control portion that inhibits display on the display unit of the shot image from the

imaging unit when the side turn signal is lit," as recited in independent claim 3, and similarly recited in independent claim 13.

Remillard teaches that an advantage of the band pass filter 22 is that it prevents saturation of pixel elements, i.e., blooming, in the camera 20 by visible light emitted from the headlamps of other automobiles. See col. 4, lines 26-30. However, an image in Remillard is continuously captured. Therefore, Remillard cannot reasonably be considered to teach or suggest a control portion that inhibits display on a display unit of a shot image from the imaging unit when a side turn signal is lit, as set forth in claims 3 and 13.

In the vehicle periphery device of claim 3, an advantage is that a dazzle inhibiting effect can be achieved when the side turn signal light is lit, as discussed above. See paragraphs [0047] - [0049] of the specification. The dazzle inhibiting effect for a camera image may be achieved by controlling a shutter of the camera. However, contrary to Remillard, an image is intermittently displayed.

For example, in Fig. 6, an ECU 200 is connected to a camera 10. See paragraph [0062] of the specification. The ECU is provided with a flash detection portion 212, a timing adjustment portion 214 and a camera control portion 216. See paragraph [0065] of the specification. When the flash detection portion 212 detects the flashing of the side turn signal light 18, the timing adjustment portion 214 identifies a lit period of the side turn signal light 18 so that the camera control portion 216 may control a shutter to open and close in synchronization with a flash cycle of the side turn signal light 18. See paragraph [0065] of the specification.

In other words, the camera 10 does not execute imaging when the side turn signal light 18 is lit. See paragraph [0067] of the specification. As a result, a shot image in which the side turn signal light 18 has a dazzling appearance is not displayed on a display. See

paragraph [0067] of the specification. Remillard does not teach or suggest such features or provide such advantages.

Further, Remillard does not disclose, teach or suggest a vehicle body construction including "a shielding portion that shields an optical path that connects the side turn signal light and the imaging unit," as recited in independent claim 9, and similarly recited in independent claim 14.

Remillard also does not disclose, teach or suggest a vehicle imaging device including "a polarized filter disposed to block, amongst light that is incident on the imaging unit, light from an imaged area of the side turn signal light," as recited in independent claim 11, and similarly recited in independent claim 15.

The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a shielding portion to shield an optical path from any lamp. However, as discussed above, the band pass filter 22 of Remillard is used to allow only a near-infrared (NIR) light component to enter a camera. Because Remillard does not teach or suggest shielding or blocking an optical path of light or light traveling from a particular direction, no motivation exists to include a shielding portion to shield an optical path or block light from a particular direction. Therefore, Remillard does not teach or suggest the vehicle body construction of claims 9 and 14 and the vehicle imaging device of claims 11 and 15.

Stark does not remedy the deficiencies of Remillard discussed above.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claims 1, 3, 9, 11 and 13-15 are patentable and would not have been rendered obvious by Remillard and Stark, alone or in permissible combination. Claims 2, 4-8, 10 and 12, variously depend from claims 1, 3 and 9, and thus also are patentable over and would not have been rendered obvious by any permissible combination of Remillard and Stark. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-15 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Holly N. Moore
Registration No. 50,212

JAO:HNM/hs

Attachment:

Petition for One Month Extension of Time

Date: March 14, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--